

## REMARKS

### 1. Claim 1

In the Office action claim 1 was rejected as allegedly being anticipated by Wygodny et al. Applicant has amended claim 1 to more clearly distinguish the invention from the cited prior art. Specifically, claim 1 has been amended to define a method for graphically tracking a progression of instructions through one or more hardware components that includes, *inter alia*, tracking each of a plurality of graphical icons by generating a graphical display of a plurality of execution pipelines, each of which has indicia associated therewith that differs from the indicia associated with the remaining pipelines of the plurality of execution pipelines and placing a subset of the plurality of graphical icons adjacent to a first sub-portion of the indicia associated with one of the plurality of execution pipelines; and displaying a progression of each of the plurality of graphical icons through the one or more hardware components during the execution of the code segment by sequentially placing graphical icons of the subset adjacent to additional sub-portions of the indicia associated with the one of the plurality of execution pipelines.

Applicants advocate these features to allow a user to quickly visualize the internal operation of a performance simulator when graphically tracking the progression of instructions through hardware components. See ¶[0018]. Specifically, code segments are associated with graphical icons to have a particular pattern, e.g., appearance characteristic. See ¶[0024]. Execution pipelines are associated with a display of indicia having a characteristic, as well, e.g., a pattern. If the characteristic of the icon is found to be distinguishable from that of the characteristic of the indicia associated with the pipeline that it is adjacent to, then an error in operation is detected. See ¶[0024]. In the example provided, the angle of the hatch pattern of graphical icons 216 (diagonal) matches the angle of the hatch pattern of instruction execution pipeline 206, which is a diagonal. See *id.* This is indicated

as demonstrating that integer instruction execution pipeline 206 picked the correct add instructions. See *id.* Conversely, another example shows that the loads and stores execution pipeline 208, represented by a pattern having orthogonally extending lines, e.g., a square pattern picked the incorrect icon 208 that has lines that are diagonal. See *id.* This facilitates a user's quick visually check to determine whether there is an error in the performance simulator or in the CPU design. See *id.*

Wygodny et al., on the other hand is completely silent with respect to these features. Rather, Wygodny et al. simply teaches forming a graphical display of the operation of a computer program in the form of a tree structure. Wygodny et al. is completely silent with respect to associating icons having a visual characteristic with execution pipelines having a similar visual characteristic to measure the operation of hardware. Therefore, based upon the foregoing, Applicants respectfully contend that amended claim 1 is neither anticipated nor rendered obvious in view of Wygodny et al.

## 2. Claim 13

In the Office action claim 13 was rejected as allegedly being anticipated by Wygodny et al. Applicant has amended claim 13 to more clearly distinguish the invention from the cited prior art. Claim 13 defines a computer readable medium having program instructions to carry-out the operations set forth in claim 1. Applicants submit that the arguments set forth above with respect to claim 1 apply with equal weight to amended claim 13. Therefore, Applicants respectfully contend that Wygodny et al. neither anticipates nor renders obvious amended claim 13.

////

### 3. Dependent Claims

Considering that the dependent claims include all of the features of the independent claims from which they depend, the dependent claims are patentable to the extent that the independent claims are patentable. As a result, Applicants respectfully contend that a *prima facie* case of either anticipation or obviousness is not present with respect to the dependent claims for the reasons set forth above with respect to the independent claims from which they depend.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully request further examination in view of the amendments and remarks set forth above. A Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited. If any additional fees are due in connection with filing this Amendment, the Commissioner is also authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 50-0805 (Order No. SUNMP360). If the Examiner has any questions concerning the present amendment, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at (408) 774-6910.

Respectfully submitted,

/Kenneth C. Brooks/

Kenneth C. Brooks  
Reg. No. 38,393

MARTINE PENILLA & GENCARELLA, LLP  
710 Lakeway Drive, Suite 200  
Sunnyvale, California 94085  
Tel: (408) 749-6900  
Customer No. 32291